

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 14-20 and 25-30 and 34-40 were pending at the time of examination. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 18, 25, 27-28, 34-38, and 40 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-20 and 25-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement and the enable requirement, respectively.

With respect to the written description requirement, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. There is nothing in claim 1 that states that the step of "allowing...the user to edit the calculator web page..." must be done in the "calculator mode," as inferred by the Examiner. However, in order to further clarify claim 1, the applicant has amended claim 1 to specify that the step of "allowing... the user to edit the calculator web page..." is done in the "preview mode." Support for these amendments can be found on pages 8-9 of the originally filed specification, as well as in FIGs. 2 and 3 of the drawings.

With respect to the enablement requirement, the applicant also respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion for the same reasons that were discussed in the above paragraph. Furthermore, the functionality of changing cells from being editable to non-editable (and vice versa) by clicking on them is described in the specification starting on page 9, line 15.

The applicant respectfully submits that the specification fully supports claim 1, as amended, both with respect to written description and enablement. The same reasoning applies to other claims having similar limitations. For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be removed.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10-20 and 25-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chester et al., Mastering Excel 97 (hereinafter "Chester") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,784 to Wei (hereinafter "Wei"), and in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0058277 to Bowman-Amuah (hereinafter "Bowman"). The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Examiner has acknowledged that Chester fails to disclose the ability to allow the user to change at least one of the editable cells to non-editable, and to change at least one of the non-

editable cells to editable in the web browser, and relies on Wei for this feature. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show a motivation to combine Chester and Wei. While Wei may disclose a thin client computing approach in which the applications run on backend servers, there is no mention in Wei of spreadsheet applications. Furthermore, nothing in Chester suggests a desire to look at Wei, in particular since Chester already describes a mechanism (i.e., using the Excel 97 application) for changing the editability of the spreadsheets. A user of the application described in Chester would not be motivated to find a different method to change the editability of a spreadsheet, and particularly not to change the editability of the spreadsheet once the spreadsheet has been published at a website, since Chester explicitly states that “The worksheet is intended to be used by many non-technical users, and needs to be reasonably bulletproof. When you are done, you protect the worksheet so that users will not be able to delete objects or edit certain locked cells.” (Chester, page 600, first paragraph). Merely quoting Wei, as the Examiner has done, to “overcome the bottleneck of current web-based computing not being able to construct a rich full-featured Graphical User Interface with the same kind of look and feel as traditional software” (Office Action page 7, last line – page 8 line 2) is not a sufficient motivation to combine Chester and Wei. Furthermore, the Examiner needs to show a reasonable expectation of success, which the Examiner has failed to do since he has not shown how the mechanisms in Wei would be applied to the static spreadsheet of Chester.

Furthermore, claim 1, as amended, recites:

“allowing, via the JavaScript Dynamic HTML of the calculator web page, the user to display the requested calculator web page in a calculator preview mode in which the user is allowed to edit the calculator web page as a web-based spreadsheet, wherein the web-based spreadsheet comprises JavaScript code that allows a user to change at least one of the non-editable cells to editable in response to clicking on the at least one of the editable cells without additional input, and to change at least one of the editable cells to non-editable in response to clicking on the at least one of the non-editable cells without additional input.”

The Examiner acknowledges that both Wei and Chester fail to disclose changing the editability of a cell by clicking without additional input, and relies on Bowman for this purpose. Bowman discloses a “Netcentric Architecture Framework” which “identifies those *run-time services* required when an application executes in a Netcentric environment” (Bowman, paragraph [0557]). That is, various services which are accessible over a network, such as the Internet, are called by a client application when needed. One type of such services are the “Direct Manipulation Services,” which “enable applications to provide a direct manipulation

interface” that “allows users to manage multiple ‘application objects’ by manipulating visual representations of those objects.” (Bowman, paragraph [0815]). These Direct Manipulation Services are further divided into “Display” and “Input/Validation”. The Display services “enable applications to represent application objects as icons and control the display characteristics...of these icons” (Bowman, paragraph [0816]) and the Input/Validations services “enable applications to invoke validation or processing logic when an end user ‘acts on’ an application object” (Bowman, paragraph [0817]). “Acting on” an object is described in the same paragraph as “single clicking, double clicking, dragging, or sizing.”

Thus, what Bowman describes is acting on an application object to invoke a run-time service. Respectfully, this does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed limitation of having a web-based spreadsheet that “comprises JavaScript code that allows a user to change at least one of the non-editable cells to editable in response to clicking on the at least one of the editable cells without additional input, and to change at least one of the editable cells to non-editable in response to clicking on the at least one of the non-editable cells without additional input,” as specified in claim 1. Also, like Wei, Bowman fails to disclose spreadsheet applications.

Finally, the combination of the references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Even if it were possible to combine Chester, Wei, and Bowman, the combination still would not teach the limitations of displaying a calculator web page in a calculator mode and in a calculator preview mode, respectively. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6 and 10 were rejected using the same rationale as for claim 1. Claim 6 has been canceled, in view of the amendments that were made to claim 1. For reasons substantially similar to those set forth above, the applicant respectfully contends that the rejection of claims 5 and 10 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10. The rejection of claim 11 is unsupported by the art for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 10 and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 12 was rejected using the same rationale as claim 1 and is thus not rendered obvious for at least the reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, claim 12 recites that “any cell depending on the value in another cell defaults to being non-editable in response to the web-based spreadsheet being initially displayed in the calculator preview mode...” While Chester may disclose that “you protect the worksheet so that users will not be able to delete objects or edit certain locked cells,” as alleged by the Examiner on page 9 of the most recent Office Action, Chester does not specify that these “certain locked cells” must be “any cell depending on the value in another cell,” as required by claim 12. Thus,

for at least these reasons the cited art does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 12, and the rejection should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 13-20 depend from claim 12. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 12, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Independent claim 25 was rejected using the same rational as claim 1. The applicant has amended claim 25 similarly to claim 1, and thus the rejection should be withdrawn for at least the reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 25. Thus, the rejection of claims 26 and 27 is unsupported by the art for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 25 and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 28 was rejected using the same rational as claim 1, and thus the rejection should be withdrawn for at least the reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 28. Thus, the rejection of claims 29 and 30 is unsupported by the art for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 28 and should be withdrawn. The Examiner also rejected claims 31-33. However, these claims were canceled by the applicant in the previous office action response, and will therefore not be discussed here.

Claims 34-40 were rejected using the same rational as claim 1, and thus the rejection should be withdrawn for at least the reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chester in view of Wei in view of Bowman and further in view of "Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition" by Courter et al., published in 1999 by SYBEX Inc. (hereinafter "Courter"). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes the distinguishing recitations of claim 1. Courter does not anticipate or render obvious any of the subject matter in claim 1. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest all the recitations of claim 2, and that the rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 3-4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chester in view of Wei in view of Bowman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,733 to Pollack et al. (hereinafter "Pollack"). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and the applicant respectfully submits that neither claim 3 nor claim 4 is rendered obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and that the rejection be withdrawn.

The applicant has amended independent claim 7 to more particularly point out the invention. Since claim 7 contains similar distinguishing recitation to claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is not rendered obvious for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7, and it is thus submitted that the rejection of claims 8-9 be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 7.

Finally, the applicant has amended some claims to change "said" to "the" in order to make the claims more consistent, as well as to correct some minor grammatical errors in the claims.

### **Conclusion**

The applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
MOLLBORN PATENTS

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Fredrik Mollborn". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Fredrik Mollborn  
Reg. No. 48,587

2840 Colby Drive  
Boulder, CO 80305  
(303) 459-4527